



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1



Revised-ms_AJAEES
_16095_v2.docx

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_16095
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Community-Based Forest Management Program as a Strategy on Forest Restoration Using Rainforestation Approach in Cienda and San-Vicente, Baybay City, Leyte
New Title:	Effectiveness of Community-Based Forest Management Program as a Strategy on Forest Restoration in Cienda and San-Vicente, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Abstract Include conclusion and recommendations Introduction Lines 15 and 16 does not delimit the problem, e.g. 'protest against the policing actions of government agencies', is it in the Philippines only or it's a global issue where people protest against the policing actions of government agencies. Lines 24 to 28 are more of discussions that introduction. In introduction, introduce the reader to the issues of focus, e.g. authors can expand on how the government conducts or promotes the reforestation programmes, their success and challenges. In line 30, Authors start the sentence by saying, 'In this connection,.....' but the connection is not explained. Lines 62 to 64 are repeated see lines 43 and 45. Objectives The objectives have improved, but objective (2) can be revised especially the word 'assess', more appropriate words like 'determine' may do where you want to determine the sense of ownership. Here assessing the sense of ownership may be complicated as this may require more time or a comparison of the previous state of sense of ownership and the current state. Methods Information on site selection has improved, but authors can provide more detail, especially on the size of the targeted community, size of membership and non-members. Formulation and pre-testing of survey instrument Authors mention in objectives issues of preparedness, ownership, etc, but these were not included in semi-structured interviews, so did authors collect data on these aspects? Sample size Authors have improved, but there is need to be particular on detail such as grammar, etc.	It's a global issue wherein the author of the source cited 6 countries around the world for this study. The authors would like to add this findings due to the reason that it explains the fact on how the problem starts. These are more on the questions of why there is a need to evaluate forest governance. Thus it serves as the background on the objectives of the study. I changed it with "In response,..." to associate this sentence to the preceeding paragraph. Lines 43-45 were removed. I changed it with determine instead of assess. Please see subtopic on "sample size" for the size of membership



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Data Collection

Authors talk of approved survey questionnaires, but in some areas they talk of semi-structured interview guide. Be specific on the data collection instrument(s) used.

Focus group discussion

The comments made previously were not addressed, e.g. how many FGDs were done and what was the size of each FGD? What were the issues or themes discussed in the FGDs? How were FGD members selected, e.g. the sampling method and why?

Results and discussion

Authors start to discuss indicators without first presenting the results. This becomes strange as the reader is left wondering what is being discussed.

3.1.1 Socio-Demographic Profile between CSVFA Members and Non-members

Again, authors start with discussion and lines 174 and 175 are mixed with aspects of methods, e.g. ‘..comparison between the two groups (members and non-members) was presented and analyzed accordingly in order to identify their differences in terms of their characters and traits in forest restoration in relation to their socio-demographic profile.’ This fits more under methods

Table 2 on socio-demographic profile needs more detail, e.g. what do the figures in the Table represent, e.g. are they the means and standard deviation or range or what?

3.1.2 Environmental Education

The problem of starting with discussion keeps on recurring. Start with your results before linking with other studies otherwise it's like a literature review paper.

Lines starting 219 to 221 are confusing, revise!!

Table 3, it was going to be more informing if authors compared like to like, e.g. comparing attendance to same or similar trainings.

Line 235, authors' talk of 'certain environmental problem' but do not specify which environmental problem they are referring to.

Line 256, Again, authors start with a discussion or literature review instead of presenting their results first.

Paragraph covering lines 315 to 320, can authors confirm that this is part of a 'sense of ownership' as they claim. The text appears to be not linked or connected to sense of ownership.

Paragraph covering lines 322 to 328 should be under methods section and not results.

Table 5 is not clear, is it only for members? If so why non-members were left out and yet authors gave the impression that they wanted to make comparisons.

Generally throughout the results section, authors begin by presenting or discussing other studies done before they present their work. This should be corrected as this is not the norm unless it's a review paper.

Figure 3 is on CSVFA framework, this figure is of interest, but then how does this framework fit into the study considering that authors did not have an objective on developing a framework. This figure should be explained well linking it to study objectives.

List of references

Noted.

I wrote indicators first because this will be the leading part of my results and discussions under this topic. In short ways, this serves as just the introductory part for the topic about indicators..

Yes, it is.

They only have the same activity (First column) attended however, topics discussed to each of the trainings they attended were different

Any environmental problems like water scarcity or drought, excessive rain which causes flashfloods and land slides.

Noted.

Noted.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

The format should be consistent, e.g. some start with surname and then initials, while other start with initials then surname, e.g. Cao, S., Xu, C., Chen, L. and Wang, X. 2009. <i>Attitudes of Farmers in China's Northern Shaanxi Province Towards the Land-Use Changes Required Under the Grain for Green Project, and Implications for the Project's Success</i>. Elsevier Ltd. Drijver, C.A. and Sajise, P.E. 1992. "Local Resource Management and Environmental Action Research", <i>In Forestry for the people Field Research and Theory on Environment and Development in the Cagayan Valley, Philippines</i>. Cabagan, Isabela, Philippines: Cagayan Valley Program of Isabela State University. Elliott. S.D., D. Blakesley and K. Hardwick, 2013. <i>Restoring Tropical Forests: a practical guide</i>. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew; 344 pp.	In what way does we compare it? Actually, it was not the authors intention to develop a framework. Figure 3 was done because of what the authors found out during the conduct of the study. It's perhaps the summary of the over-all results regarding the effectiveness of CBFM in the site. Done.
--	--